

## Remarks

Applicant's representative again wishes to express his appreciation for the interview kindly extended on March 24, 2010. During the interview a prototype of a product according to the invention was demonstrated.

During the interview the prior art was discussed. As was pointed out by applicant's representative, the prior art does not teach or suggest a loop means for a pointing device wherein stiffening strips or equivalent means have a collective axial length greater than the circumferential widths of a plurality of stiffening strips or equivalent means.

In order to better bring out the distinction, several amendments to the claims were discussed. The Examiner indicated that the above amendments appear to overcome the rejections of the claims. The Examiner agreed to consider the amendments and contact the undersigned if a request for continued examination is needed to secure entry of the amendments that place the application in condition for allowance.

Also during the interview the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 112 was discussed. It was pointed out that the "situated over" language did not mean connected. Rather, the language "at least a portion of the joint is situated over one of the stiffening strips" meant that the joint was overlapped by a stiffening strip.

In view of the foregoing, request is made for timely issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Don W. Bulson/

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Don W. Bulson, Reg. No. 28,192

1621 Euclid Avenue  
Nineteenth Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115